

I subscribe to XM Radio because local stations SUCK. I was content to hear that local weather and traffic reports would be available on XM. I've enjoyed this particular service since I travel a lot. It is easy to find and always accessible.

Broadcast radio stations don't provide this. You would literally have to sit and listen for 20 - 35 min (during peak times, longer during off-peak times) of junk before you got the much needed information. By this time, it may already be useless, even if you were able to find a radio station that offers weather and traffic reports in the first place. Are you aware that not all broadcast radio stations offer weather and traffic reports, much less in a constant stream? And, if you happen to be in a new city, chances are that it will take you a long time to find a radio station that provides it.

If the FCC decides to OK NAB's petition 04-160, it will not increase chances of me listening to broadcast radio to get a weather or traffic report. I'd rather not bother with broadcast radio. However, it does pose an interesting dilemma, if the FCC does this against satellite radio, who or what will be next? Cable news stations cannot give "local" weather; broadcast TV stations can't give traffic reports, DVRs would be considered illegal because you could skip commercials, etc?

The only difference I see between all these mediums is: private companies pay (via commercials) for broadcast radio and TV stations; with satellite radio, DVRs, as well as certain cable TV stations the customer pays not to have to see or hear commercials and for what they consider a higher quality product.

I think this quote says it all: "the customer is always right". In this case, who are the FCC's TRUE customers? I believe that would be the public, am I right?